

berg", that of Sint Hyronimus, in the northern region of Curaçao; in fact, most of the coral-capped monadnocks of the southwestern coast are small "table-mountains".

In conclusion, I may be excused if I diverge considerably from the field of conchology to mention another interesting effect of past isolation on Curaçao. The prevailing language of this island, Bonaire and Aruba is Papiamentu, which is only spoken by the natives of this group. The name itself may be roughly translated as "Much talk" or "Art of talking"; it is also called "Spaansch", because many of its users truly believe that it is the original Spanish. Actually, it probably started as a simplified slave-dialect of Portuguese, but it has acquired words from all of the tongues spoken in the West Indies and is characterized by a lack of conjugations, tenses and abstract terms, which makes it strikingly different from the Romance languages. Another peculiarity, which it possesses in common with some primitive languages, is the introduction of each verb by a syllable, pronounced "ta", which simply indicates that the next word will be this part of speech. However, the prospective collectors in Curaçao need not be deterred by any question of a common language, as English is widely spoken and understood in the islands; in fact, the natives, starting with the limited Papiamentu, seem to have a propensity to acquire smatterings of several languages, without the ability to express a complicated idea in any of them.

---

#### THE TYPE OF ANCYLASTRUM BOURGUIGNAT

BY H. BURRINGTON BAKER

---

Kennard and Woodward (1925, NAUT. XXXVII, p. 83) have recently re-opened the question of the type of *Ancylastrum* Bgt. (Feb. 15, 1853, J. de C. IV, 60, 63) and the validity of *Pseudancylyus* Walker (1921, NAUT. XXXV. 58). They come to the conclusion that the type of the former is *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, while Walker (1921, 5-9) had decided that it was *Ancylus cumingianus* Bgt. (either May 1, 1853, J. de C. IV, 170; or July 25, 1854, P. Z. S., 91).

The differences between the viewpoint of Kennard and Woodward and that of Walker seem to be divisible into three rather separate questions:

1. What species are included in the original *Ancylastrum* (l. c.)?
2. Was *Ancylastrum* proposed as a substitute for *Ancylus* Gray?
3. What subsequent choice of type is valid?

The divergences of the two arguments may be tabulated for each as follows:

## Kennard and Woodward

1. It cannot include species described in subsequent papers.

2. Yes.

3. Subsequent choice inoperative and could not be *A. cumingianus* in any case.

## Walker

1. As no species names were mentioned in the original publication, it includes all species that satisfy its definition, regardless of their date of description.

2. No.

3. The first choice was by Bgt. in a subsequent paper (l. c.), where the type, *A. cumingianus* Bgt. was also described.

As regards the first bone of contention, I must personally agree with Kennard and Woodward that any genus *should* include only those species known at the date of its description. However, as pointed out by Walker (1921, 7), the International Commission on Zoölogical Nomenclature has definitely ruled otherwise in its Opinion 46, where, in a similar case, it has decided that *Aclastus rufipes* Ashmead (1902) is the type of *Aclastus* Foerster (1868). For this reason, Walker's decision is certainly the correct one; *Ancylastrum* Bgt. (Feb. 15, 1853) does include *Ancylus cumingianus* Bgt. (either May 1, 1853; or July 25, 1854).

The second question is more difficult, but must, I believe, be answered in the negative. In the first place, there is not and never was any such "generic name" as *Ancylus* Gray; *Ancylus*

Müller (1774), type *Patella lacustris* Linné (chosen by Children, 1823-4) is the only legitimate *Ancylus* s. s. In 1840, Gray (Turton's Manual, new ed., 249) did list *A. fluviatilis* as the only species of *Ancylus* s. s., but if this is the description of a monotypic genus or division then the mention of only one species for a genus or subgenus in any local list does exactly the same thing. This is not a case similar to that outlined in Opinion 6 of the International Commission, because *Velletia* itself was certainly not proposed as a monotypic group as Gray (footnote, p. 250) also included Guilding's "two West Indian species" by page reference. However, it is true that Gray did in 1847 (P. Z. S., 181) incorrectly designate the type of *Ancylus* (although Bourguignat does not cite this publication).

In the second place, even if *Ancylus* Gray (1847) be regarded as a preoccupied genus or subgenus, Bourguignat did not definitely propose his *Ancylastrum* as a substitute. Bourguignat first reviewed Beck's division of *Ancylus* and decided "qu'il devient impossible d'y attacher la moindre importance." Then he discussed Gray's 1840 paper, designated the type of *Velletia*, but mentioned no other species. He also mentioned the similar grouping of l'abbaye Dupuy but was again careful to omit all reference to any species but *A. lacustris*. Finally, he wrote: "Quant à nous, nous adoptons la division du genre en deux coupes, auxquelles nous trouvons des caractères distincts, tirés de la conformation du test, et surtout de celle de l'animal: caractère que nous formulons comme il suit:—," and proceeded to define his groups *Ancylastrum* and *Velletia*. Again, following the descriptions (p. 63), he admitted "la nature typique qu'il faut reconnaître aux espèces (note plural) que nous prétendons classer dans cette section" (*Ancylastrum*), definitely adopted *Velletia* Gray (1840) for his second group, but was still careful to omit any recognition of Gray's other group.

As Bourguignat commonly did use the word type in quite the sense of the Code (although he apparently regarded the first species as the automatic type), my own surmise, which appears quite as valid as that of Kennard and Woodward, is that Bourguignat already had *A. cumingianus* in mind as the genotype of his new section. It may be claimed that he incorrectly

believed *Ancylastrum* to be *Ancylus* s. s., but there is no reason to consider it as a substitute for *Ancylus* Gray (1840 or 1847).

Finally to take up the third question, as no type was designated or indicated in the original description of *Ancylastrum*, the first subsequent choice of type is operative. The species later chosen by the author himself, *A. cumingianus* (either date) is included in the original description, according to Opinion 46 of the International Commission, and must be the true type of the genus. *Ancylastrum* does apply to the Tasmanian group and *Pseudancylus* is the correct generic name for *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller.

---

#### THE STATUS OF AMICULA

BY TOM IREDALE\*

---

Loricata nomenclature is still unsettled, as Pilsbry's memorable basic work must be reviewed in the light of the thirty years' intensive research initiated by its publication. In the Bulletin of the U. S. National Museum No. 112, 1921, pp. 197-198, Dall included a Family Cryptochitonidae with three genera, *Cryptochiton* Gray 1847, for *stelleri* Middendorff, *Chlamydochiton* Dall 1878, for *amiculatus* Pallas, and *Symmetrogephyrus* (Middendorff 1848) Chenu 1859, for *pallasii* Middendorff and *vestitus* Broderip and Sowerby. As I am partly responsible for this nomination it is incumbent to record some apparently necessary rectifications. In the Proc. Malac. Soc. Lond., Vol. xi, June, 1914, pp. 128-129, I showed that *Amicula* in 1840 was indeterminable exactly, and that in 1843 it fell as a synonym of *Cryptoconchus*. Apparently this conclusion was accepted without careful criticism but it was not infallible. Twice in the year 1842 *Amicula* had been noted—admittedly in an indirect manner—in an acceptable place, and as these introductions agree there can be no argument as to the recognition of the genus. However it is regrettable that through this observation *Amicula* must replace *Cryptochiton* as used by Dall, and the family name be cited as *Amiculidae*. Thus, Sowerby in the

\* By permission of the Trustees of the Australian Museum, Sydney.